

### **REMARKS**

The Final Office Action of July 6, 2010, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto.

#### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 12-20 and 35 have previously been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 7, 21, 22, 28, 34, 36, and 38 are amended to further clarify the scope of protection. Thus, claims 1-11, 21-34, and 36-38 are pending. No new matter has been added.

#### **Substance of Interview**

The applicants thank the examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on August 11, 2010 and August 19, 2010. Pursuant to MPEP 713.04, this response includes the substance of the interview.

With regard to the examiner's summary of the August 11, 2010 interview, the Applicants wish to clarify for the record that what was intended to be conveyed during the interview was that in the instant application initial search criteria are received, the criteria are modified, and the modified criteria are used to produce a search result in response to the initial search criteria being received.

#### **Rejection Of Independent Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 21, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh (USP 5,493,677) (hereinafter *Balogh*), in view of Dudkiewicz (USP 6,651,253) (hereinafter *Dudkiewicz*), and further in view of Bowman (USP 6,006,225) (hereinafter *Bowman*). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites:

the suggestion database processor is configured to:

receive a message containing a first set of one or more  
search request criteria and

produce a list of keywords,

wherein receiving the message causes the suggestion

database processor to:

create a second set of one or more search request criteria by modifying the first set of search request criteria with the produced list of keywords, and

initiate a search of the suggestion database using the second set of search request criteria.

The office action relies on *Bowman* for this feature. *Bowman* is “a search engine... which suggests related terms to the user to allow the user to refine a search.” (abstract). The office action recites, “Bowman teaches wherein the related terms are presented through links which combine the original query terms and a respective related term. Once the user clicks on the appropriate link, the modified query is submitted to the search engine and produces the results.” (page 13). The action alleges that the search performed once the user clicks on a link in *Bowman* discloses the suggestion database processor of claim 1. However, amended claim 1 recites that “receiving [a message containing a first set of one or more search request criteria] causes the suggestion database processor to: create a second set of one or more search request criteria... and initiate a search of the suggestion database using the second set of search request criteria.” As discussed during the interview, *Bowman* fails to teach or suggest at least this feature. The applicant submits that amended claim 1 is therefore allowable over the cited art. Indeed, neither *Balogh* nor *Dudkiewicz* cure this deficiency.

Amended claims 21 and 36 are allowable over the cited art for at least similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

#### **Rejection Of Dependent Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 34, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Balogh*, in view of *Dudkiewicz*, and further in view of *Bowman*.

Claims 2-3, 5-11, 22-23, 26-33, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Balogh* in view of *Dudkiewicz*, further in view of *Bowman*, and further in view of *Cappi* (US 20020038308) (hereinafter *Cappi*).

Claims 4, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Balogh*, in view of *Dudkiewicz*, further in view of *Bowman*, further in view of *Cappi*, and further in view of *Karaali* (USP 6,182,028) (hereinafter *Karaali*).

Claims 2-11, 22-34, and 37-38 each depend from claim 1 or claim 21. Neither *Cappi* nor

*Karaali*, alone or in combination, cures the defects of *Balogh*, *Dudkiewicz*, and *Bowman* with regard to claims 1 and 21. As such, claims 2-11, 22-34, and 37-38 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their base claims, and further in view of the features recited therein.

### **Conclusion**

All rejections having been addressed, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 6, 2010

By: /Daniel G. Cardy/

Daniel G. Cardy  
Registration No. 66,537

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3125  
Fax: (202) 824-3001